

## **REMARKS**

Applicants thank the Examiners for the personal and telephone interview granted February 28 at which Edmund Mangold from OCE in Germany, Brett Valiquet, and Melvin Robinson participated. During the interview, it was agreed that claims 51, 65, 68 and 69 would be amended as indicated herein. The Examiners indicated during the interview that the claims as amended herein distinguish over the prior art of record. The Examiners further indicated that they would conduct an updated search.

During the interview it was noted that for claims 51, 65, and 68, the file with the information to be printed does not have the unique identifier prior to printing of the information on the document. This of course is also brought out by the order of steps in the method claim since the printing step occurs in sequence later in the claim. It was agreed that Hohberger does not have this for the reasons previously pointed out in Amendment D. Also for claim 69 it was agreed that the file having the information for printing does not have the unique identifier stored therein prior to a reading of the unique identifier, again apparent from the sequence of the method steps in claim 69 since the reading step occurs in sequence later in the claim. It was also agreed that Hohberger does not have this feature also for the reasons noted in previous Amendment D.

Respective dependent claims distinguish at least for the reasons noted with respect to the independent claims.

Allowance of the case is respectfully requested.

Submitted by,



(Reg. 27,841)

SCHIFF, HARDIN LLP  
**CUSTOMER NO. 26574**  
Patent Department  
6600 Sears Tower  
233 South Wacker Drive  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
Telephone: 312/258-5786  
Attorneys for Applicants.

CHI\4890430.1